DESCRIPTION OF THE TWO-NUCLEON SYSTEM ON THE BASIS OF THE BARGMANN REPRESENTATION OF THE S MATRIX

V. A. Babenko and N. M. Petrov [1]

Bogolyubov Institute for Theoretical Physics,

National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kiev, Ukraine

arXiv:nucl-th/0502041v1 15 Feb 2005

For the effective-range function $k\cot\delta$, a pole approximation that involves a small number of parameters is derived on the basis of the Bargmann representation of the S matrix. The parameters of this representation, which have a clear physical meaning, are related to the parameters of the Bargmann S matrix by simple equations. By using a polynomial least-squares fit to the function $k\cot\delta$ at low energies, the triplet low-energy parameters of neutron-proton scattering are obtained for the latest experimental data of Arndt et al. on phase shifts. The results are $a_t = 5.4030\,\mathrm{fm}$, $r_t = 1.7494\,\mathrm{fm}$, and $v_2 = 0.163\,\mathrm{fm}^3$. With allowance for the values found for the low-energy scattering parameters and for the pole parameter, the pole approximation of the function $k\cot\delta$ provides an excellent description of the triplet phase shift for neutron-proton scattering over a wide energy range ($T_{\mathrm{lab}} \lesssim 1000\,\mathrm{MeV}$), substantially improving the description at low energies as well. For the experimental phase shifts of Arndt et al., the triplet shape parameters v_n of the effective-range expansion are obtained by using the pole approximation. The description of the phase shift by means of the effective-range expansion featuring values found for the low-energy scattering parameters proves to be fairly accurate over a broad energy region extending to energy values approximately equal to the energy at which this phase shift changes sign, this being indicative of a high accuracy and a considerable value of the effective-range expansion in describing experimental data on nucleon-nucleon scattering. The properties of the deuteron that were calculated by using various approximations of the effective-range function comply well with their experimental values.

---

[1] E-mail address: pet@online.com.ua

1. INTRODUCTION

The S matrix [1, 2] is a fundamental quantity in scattering theory. At a fixed value of the orbital angular momentum ℓ, the S matrix is a function of the wave number k related to the energy E of two colliding particles in the c.m. frame by the equation $E = \hbar^2 k^2 / 2m$, where m is the reduced mass of the system and $\hbar$ is the Plank constant. In the following, we restrict our consideration to the case of zero orbital angular momentum (we omit the index $\ell = 0$ for the sake of simplicity). The fact that a unified description of both scattering and bound states in two-particle systems can be constructed on the basis of the respective S matrix is an important consequence of the analytic properties of this matrix. In general, the analytic properties of the S matrix in the k plane are rather complicated; however, a number of important results can be obtained in considering specific physical systems by using an S matrix whose analytic properties are simple. In the k plane, the S matrix satisfies the relation [1]

$$S^*\left(k^*\right) \cdot S\left(k\right) = 1\,. \tag{1}$$

At real k values, this relation coincides with the unitarity condition.

In potential-scattering theory, the S matrix $S\left(k\right)$ is expressed in terms of the Jost function $F\left(k\right)$ as [3, 4]

$$S\left(k\right) = \frac{F\left(-k\right)}{F\left(k\right)}\,. \tag{2}$$

At complex values of k, the Jost function $F\left(k\right)$ satisfies the condition

$$F^*\left(-k^*\right) = F\left(k\right)\,. \tag{3}$$

The S-matrix property (1) immediately follows from this condition with allowance for (2). The behavior of the Jost function at high energies is determined by the relation

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} F\left(k\right) = 1\,. \tag{4}$$

The behavior of the S matrix at high energies directly follows from (2) and (4):

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} S\left(k\right) = 1\,. \tag{5}$$

In the case of elastic scattering, the S matrix can be expressed in terms of the phase shift $\delta\left(k\right)$ as

$$S\left(k\right) = e^{2i\delta(k)}\,. \tag{6}$$

Using relation (6) and considering that the S matrix possesses the symmetry property [1]

$$S\left(-k\right)=S^{-1}\left(k\right)\,, \tag{7}$$

one can easily see that, at real values of k, the phase shift $\delta\left(k\right)$ is an odd function of k; that is,

$$\delta\left(-k\right)=-\delta\left(k\right)\,. \tag{8}$$

From relations (5) and (6), one readily establishes the asymptotic behavior of the phase shift at high energies:

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\delta\left(k\right)=0\,. \tag{9}$$

In practice, it is very useful to introduce the effective-range function

$$k\cot\delta=ik\frac{S\left(k\right)+1}{S\left(k\right)-1}\,. \tag{10}$$

In the physical region, the function $k\cot\delta$ is real by virtue of the unitarity of the S matrix, while, in the k plane, this function is analytic everywhere, with the exception of the points where $S\left(k\right)=1$, i.e. the points where it has poles. The introduction of the function $k\cot\delta$ simplifies the investigation of the analytic properties of the S matrix. It follows from (8) that the function $k\cot\delta$ is an even function of k.

In studying nucleon-nucleon (NN) scattering at low energies, it is useful to employ the well-known effective-range expansion

$$k\cot\delta=-\frac{1}{a}+\frac{1}{2}r_0k^2+v_2k^4+v_3k^6+v_4k^8+\ldots\,, \tag{11}$$

which involves only even powers of k. The effective-range approximation corresponds to retaining only the first two terms in (11). In expansion (11), the quantities a and r_0 are, respectively, the scattering length and the effective range, while the quantities v_n are related to the potential shape. It should be noted that the quantity r_0 is a measure of the effective interaction region. In the case of nucleon-nucleon interaction, the effective range r_0 is approximately equal to the range of nuclear forces (R). If, however, one deals with the doublet neutron-deuteron (nd) interaction, the effective range is anomalously large ($r_0\sim 500\,\mathrm{fm}$), so that the statement that it is approximately equal to the range of nuclear forces ($R\sim 2\,\mathrm{fm}$) does not hold here. This is because, for nd interaction, the function $k\cot\delta$ has a pole in the vicinity of the point $k^2=0$ owing to the existence of a low-energy virtual triton state [5].

In a number of studies (see, for example, [6–8]), the authors approximated the S matrix by rational functions, this leading to so-called Bargmann potentials [4, 9]. The use of a Bargmann S matrix makes it possible to find explicit solutions to the direct and inverse scattering problems. Of particular importance are special cases where the Bargmann S matrix is determined by a small number of parameters such that physical observables are directly expressed in terms of these parameters. In [5], we showed that the use of the Bargmann S matrix corresponding to the presence of two states in the system being considered leads to the pole structure of the effective-range function (van Oers-Seagrave formula [10]). At low energies, this structure makes it possible to describe well doublet nd scattering on the basis of parameters that characterize the bound and the virtual state of the triton.

In the present study, we use the Bargmann representation of the S matrix to construct the pole approximation of the effective-range function, bearing in mind that this pole approximation is optimal for describing nucleon-nucleon scattering and that it involves a small number of parameters. The pole-approximation parameters have a clear physical meaning, and the values found for these parameters from an analysis of low-energy experimental data make it possible to obtain an excellent unified description of a bound state in the two-nucleon system (deuteron) and the triplet phase shift for neutron-proton scattering over a very wide energy range $(0 - 1000\,\mathrm{MeV})$.

2. BARGMANN REPRESENTATION OF THE S MATRIX AND POLE APPROXIMATION OF THE EFFECTIVE-RANGE FUNCTION

In order to investigate the interaction in the system of two particles, we will use the corresponding Bargmann S matrix [4, 9], which possesses simple analytic properties in the k plane. In this case, the Jost function $F(k)$ can be chosen in the simplest way in the form of a rational function,

$$F(k) = \prod_{n=1}^{N} \frac{k - i\alpha_n}{k + i\lambda_n}\,. \tag{12}$$

It has N simple zeros at the points $k = i\alpha_n$ and N simple poles at the points $k = -i\lambda_n$ and exhibits the correct asymptotic behavior (4) at high energies.

As a simple example of a Bargmann S matrix, one can consider the truncated S matrix corresponding to the well-known explicitly solvable Hulthén potential

$$V(r) = -V_0 \left(e^{r/R} - 1\right)^{-1}\,, \tag{13}$$

for which we have

$$\alpha_n = \frac{g - n^2}{2nR}\,, \quad \lambda_n = \frac{n}{2R}\,, \tag{14}$$

where

$$g = \frac{2m}{\hbar^2} V_0 R^2\,. \tag{15}$$

The Bargmann scattering matrix

$$S\left(k\right) = \prod_{n=1}^{N} \frac{k + i\alpha_n}{k - i\alpha_n} \frac{k + i\lambda_n}{k - i\lambda_n}\,, \tag{16}$$

which corresponds to the Jost function (12), has N simple "physical" poles at $k = i\alpha_n$ in the k plane. The poles lying on the imaginary axis in the upper half-plane ($\alpha_n > 0$) correspond to bound states, while the poles in the lower half-plane correspond to resonances or virtual states. The resonances in the lower half-plane are grouped in pairs symmetric with respect to the imaginary axis, while the virtual states are on the imaginary axis ($\alpha_n < 0$). In addition to the physical poles corresponding to resonances and bound and virtual states, the Bargmann S matrix (16) has N so-called "redundant" poles at $k = i\lambda_n$ in the upper half-plane, which do not correspond to any physical states. The presence, along with physical poles, of the same number of redundant poles serves as some kind of a compensation factor, ensuring the correct asymptotic behavior [see Eq. (4)] of the Jost function at infinity.

With allowance for Eqs. (2) and (3), the effective-range function (10) at real values of k can be expressed in terms of the real and the imaginary part of the Jost function as

$$k \cot\delta = -k \frac{\operatorname{Re} F\left(k\right)}{\operatorname{Im} F\left(k\right)}\,. \tag{17}$$

From the Bargmann representation (16) of the S matrix, it immediately follows that the effective-range function $k\cot\delta$ can then be written in the form of a rational function of k^2,

$$k \cot\delta = \frac{P_N\left(k^2\right)}{Q_{N-1}\left(k^2\right)}\,, \tag{18}$$

where the degrees of the polynomials $P_N\left(k^2\right)$ and $Q_{N-1}\left(k^2\right)$ of k^2 are N and $N-1$, respectively, and where the coefficients in these polynomials are completely determined by the quantities α_n and λ_n.

The representation in (18) for the function $k\cot\delta$ can be considered as a Padé approximation of this function [11] if the expansion of the function $P_N\left(k^2\right)/Q_{N-1}\left(k^2\right) \equiv \left[N/\left(N-1\right)\right]$

in a Taylor-Maclaurin series coincides with the effective-range expansion (11) up to terms of order $2N-1$. In other words, the coefficients of 1, k^2, ... , $k^{2(2N-1)}$ in the Taylor expansion of the function $[N/(N-1)]$ must coincide with the corresponding coefficients in the series in (11). The Padé approximation method was used by various authors to study nucleon-nucleon scattering (see, for example, [12–15]). It is of importance in our case that, from the Bargmann representation (16) of the S matrix, it automatically follows that the degree of the polynomial P in the numerator of the Padé approximant (18) must be greater by unity than the degree of the polynomial Q in its denominator, this being in accord with the condition of the theorem [12] on the solvability of the inverse scattering problem. In addition, one can see that, in the majority of cases, the condition $L = M + 1$ for the Padé approximant $[L/M]$ of the function $k \cot \delta$ is optimal for specific fits [13–15].

Let us now consider in detail the important particular case where the Bargmann S matrix corresponds to the presence of two physical states ($N = 2$) in the system. This is so, for example, in the doublet scattering of a neutron on a deuteron [5], in which case there are two triton states in the system, a bound and a virtual one. The scattering matrix corresponding to the presence of two states in the system can also be used to describe triplet neutron-proton scattering. Since the second state has not yet been observed experimentally in that case, the energy of this state must be considerably higher than the deuteron binding energy. If, in this case, the second state is a bound state of two nucleons, such a situation corresponds to the phenomenology of nodes that is described by a short-range deep attractive potential involving forbidden states [16–18].

If the system has two physical states, the rational Jost function and the Bargmann S matrix corresponding to it are given by

$$F(k) = \frac{k - i\alpha}{k + i\lambda} \frac{k - i\beta}{k + i\mu}\,, \tag{19}$$

$$S(k) = \frac{k + i\alpha}{k - i\alpha} \frac{k + i\beta}{k - i\beta} \frac{k + i\lambda}{k - i\lambda} \frac{k + i\mu}{k - i\mu}\,. \tag{20}$$

The first and the second factors in the S-matrix representation (20) correspond to either bound or virtual states of the system, while the third and the fourth factors correspond to redundant poles of the S matrix. The negative energies of the bound and virtual states of the system are

$$E_\alpha = -\frac{\hbar^2 \alpha^2}{2m}\,, \tag{21}$$

$$E_\beta = -\frac{\hbar^2\beta^2}{2m}\,. \tag{22}$$

The expression describing the effective-range function $k\cot\delta$ and corresponding to the presence of two states in the system immediately follows from (17) and (19). The result is

$$k\cot\delta = -\frac{1}{a}\,\frac{1 - c_2k^2 + c_4k^4}{1 + Dk^2}\,, \tag{23}$$

where, for the sake of convenience, we have explicitly isolated the scattering length a. The parameters appearing in the pole representation (23) of the function $k\cot\delta$ and the parameters α, β, λ, and μ of the Bargmann S matrix (20) are related by the equations

$$a = \frac{1}{\alpha} + \frac{1}{\beta} + \frac{1}{\lambda} + \frac{1}{\mu}\,, \tag{24}$$

$$c_2 = \frac{1}{\alpha\beta} + \frac{1}{\alpha\lambda} + \frac{1}{\alpha\mu} + \frac{1}{\beta\lambda} + \frac{1}{\beta\mu} + \frac{1}{\lambda\mu}\,, \tag{25}$$

$$c_4 = \frac{1}{\alpha\beta\lambda\mu}\,, \tag{26}$$

$$D = -\frac{1}{a}\,\frac{\alpha+\beta+\lambda+\mu}{\alpha\beta\lambda\mu}\,. \tag{27}$$

The parameter D appearing in (23) determines the pole of the effective-range function k_0^2:

$$k_0^2 = -\frac{1}{D}\,. \tag{28}$$

Expression (23), which was obtained for the function $k\cot\delta$ by the above method from the Bargmann representation of the S matrix, is a one-pole representation and involves four independent parameters. It can easily be shown that, apart from the form of presentation, the pole expression (23) coincides with the well-known empirical formulas that were given by van Oears and Seagrave [10] and by Cini, Fubini, and Stanghellini [19] and which are applied to describe, respectively, neutron-deuteron and nucleon-nucleon scattering. It is worth noting that various forms of the pole structure of the effective-range function $k\cot\delta$ have been repeatedly discussed for a rather long time and have been successfully used to describe neutron-deuteron [5, 10, 20–30] and nucleon-nucleon interactions [19, 31–35]. In the majority of cases, however, the formulas for $k\cot\delta$ were obtained empirically. But in our case, the pole formula for the function $k\cot\delta$ immediately follows from the Bargmann S matrix, which possesses simple properties and which takes into account basic physical properties of the interaction in the system being considered.

In [5], we showed that, in the case of neutron-deuteron interaction, the presence of the pole in the function $k\cot\delta$ is a direct consequence of the existence of a virtual triton state at a low energy. In the present study, the effective-range function having a pole structure will be used to describe neutron-proton interaction in the triplet (t) spin state $^3S_1$. In this case, the neutron-proton system has one bound state (deuteron), the scattering of a neutron on a proton at low energies (up to energies of about 10 MeV) being well described in the effective-range approximation. In this connection, it is convenient to recast the pole-approximation formula (23) into the form

$$k\cot\delta = -\frac{1}{a_t} + \frac{1}{2}r_t k^2 + \frac{v_2 k^4}{1 + Dk^2}\,, \tag{29}$$

where a_t and r_t are, respectively, the scattering length and the effective range, while the parameter v_2 determines the dimensionless shape parameter P_t, which is widely used in the literature, according to the relation

$$P_t = v_2/r_t^3\,. \tag{30}$$

We also note that, in the literature, definition of the dimensionless shape parameter P_t frequently differs from the one in Eq. (30) by sign. But our definition here is more convenient for future discussion.

The first two terms of the representation in (29) correspond to the effective-range approximation, while the last, pole, term describes the deviation from this approximation. The presence of this pole term makes it possible to improve, with the aid of only two additional parameters, the description of the phase shift significantly and to extend the range of applicability of this description greatly. Thus, the pole approximation (29), which was derived from the Bargmann representation of the S matrix, is a direct generalization of the effective-range approximation to the case where there are two physical states in the system. We note that the form (29) of the pole formula is more convenient for describing nucleon-nucleon scattering than that in (23), since, in (29), the low-energy scattering parameters a_t, r_t, and v_2 are isolated explicitly.

The parameters a_t and D appearing in (29) are related to the parameters of the Bargmann S matrix (20) by Eqs. (24) and (27), while the effective range r_t and the shape parameter

v_2 are given by

$$r_t = \frac{2}{a_t}\left(D + c_2\right) , \tag{31}$$

$$v_2 = -\left(\frac{1}{2}Dr_t + \frac{c_4}{a_t}\right) , \tag{32}$$

where c_2 and c_4 are related to the S-matrix parameters by Eqs. (25) and (26).

Let us now consider the specific case where the S matrix in (20) for the case of two states reduces to the S matrix for one state,

$$S\left(k\right) = \frac{k + i\alpha}{k - i\alpha}\frac{k + i\lambda}{k - i\lambda} . \tag{33}$$

In this case, the second state goes to infinity: $\beta \to \infty$ and $\mu \to \infty$. It can easily be seen that the coefficients D and v_2 then vanish in formula (29), which reduces, after that, to the effective-range-approximation formula

$$k \cot \delta = -\frac{1}{a_t} + \frac{1}{2}r_t k^2 , \tag{34}$$

where the scattering length a_t and the effective range r_t are given by

$$a_t = \frac{1}{\alpha} + \frac{1}{\lambda} , \tag{35}$$

$$r_t = \frac{2}{\alpha + \lambda} . \tag{36}$$

The dimensionless asymptotic normalization factor C_d characterizing the bound state of the two-nucleon system (deuteron) can be expressed in terms of the residue of the S matrix at the pole $k = i\alpha$ as

$$C_d^2 = \frac{i}{2\alpha} \operatorname*{Res}_{k=i\alpha} S\left(k\right) . \tag{37}$$

In the case of the S matrix for one state, C_d is given by

$$C_d^2 = \frac{\lambda + \alpha}{\lambda - \alpha} . \tag{38}$$

Upon expressing λ in terms of α and C_d^2, formulas (35) and (36) for the scattering length a_t and the effective range r_t, respectively, can be recast into the form [36]

$$a_t = \frac{2}{\alpha}\frac{C_d^2}{1 + C_d^2} , \tag{39}$$

$$r_t = \frac{1}{\alpha}\left(1 - \frac{1}{C_d^2}\right) . \tag{40}$$

Thus, formulas (39) and (40) give explicit expressions for the low-energy scattering parameters a_t and r_t in terms of parameters that characterize the bound state of the two-nucleon system (deuteron) in the case where the interaction in the system is described by the S matrix for one state. The inverse statement is also valid — namely, the parameters characterizing the deuteron can be expressed, in this case, in terms of the scattering parameters a_t and r_t as

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{r_t}\left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{2r_t}{a_t}\right)^{1/2}\right] , \tag{41}$$

$$C_d^2 = \frac{1}{(1 - 2r_t/a_t)^{1/2}} . \tag{42}$$

The case where, at finite values of β and μ, the coefficient D vanishes, while the parameter v_2 differs from zero is yet another important specific case of formula (29). This is so if the system has a virtual state whose wave number β is given by

$$\beta = -\left(\alpha + \lambda + \mu\right) . \tag{43}$$

It can be seen from (27) that, in this case, the parameter D is equal to zero, while expression (29) for the effective-range function reduces to the expression corresponding to the shape-parameter approximation,

$$k \cot \delta = -\frac{1}{a_t} + \frac{1}{2} r_t k^2 + v_2 k^4 , \tag{44}$$

where

$$r_t = 2\frac{c_2}{a_t} , \tag{45}$$

$$v_2 = P_t r_t^3 = -\frac{c_4}{a_t} , \tag{46}$$

with a_t, c_2, and c_4 being given by (24)–(26). The effective-range approximation (34) and the shape-parameter approximation (44) are among the most popular and important methods for parametrizing data on nucleon-nucleon scattering at low energies [37, 38].

In the triplet spin state, the neutron-proton scattering length a_t is positive. It follows that, in the approximation specified by Eq. (44), the sign of the shape parameter P_t is determined by the sign of the parameter c_4 in accordance with (46). Since the redundant poles $k = i\lambda$ and $k = i\mu$ of the S matrix lie in the upper half-plane and since $\alpha > 0$ and

$\beta < 0$, it follows from (26) that c_4 is negative. Therefore, the dimensionless shape parameter P_t is positive in this approximation:

$$P_t > 0\,. \tag{47}$$

Thus, we have shown that the shape-parameter approximation (44) directly follows from the Bargmann representation of the S matrix in the case where the system has two physical states of which at least one is virtual. If the system has two virtual states ($\alpha < 0$, $\beta < 0$), the shape-parameter approximation (44) follows from the Bargmann representation of the S matrix under the condition

$$(\alpha + \beta) = -\,(\lambda + \mu) \tag{48}$$

and corresponds to the description of the neutron-proton interaction in the singlet spin state.

3. CHOICE OF PARAMETERS AND DESCRIPTION OF SCATTERING IN THE TWO-NUCLEON SYSTEM

An investigation of the phase shift δ as function of energy plays a fundamental role in an analysis of data on nucleon-nucleon scattering. A traditional way to study this dependence at low energies consists in applying the effective-range approximation (34) and the shape-parameter approximation (44) [37, 38]. In order to determine the parameters a_t, r_t, and P_t, one employs experimental data on scattering and also the experimental value of the deuteron binding energy ε_d. It was shown in [38] that, in this case, the determination of the scattering parameters a_t, r_t, and P_t involved ambiguities, and this is at odds with the meaning of the effective-range expansion (11). The ambiguity in the determination of the low-energy scattering parameters was due primarily to an insufficient accuracy of experimental data at low energies. At the present time, the accuracy of experimental data is such that the ambiguity in the determination of the scattering length a_t, the effective range r_t, and the shape parameter P_t is quite removable.

By using the least squares method to construct a polynomial fit to the triplet function $k \cot\delta$ at low energies ($T_{\text{lab}} \lesssim 10$ MeV) and relying on the latest experimental data of the VPI/GWU group of Arndt et al. on neutron-proton phase shifts [39], we obtain the following values of the triplet low-energy scattering parameters a_t, r_t, and v_2:

$$a_t = 5.4030\,\text{fm}\,, \tag{49}$$

$$r_t = 1.7494\,\mathrm{fm}\,, \tag{50}$$

$$v_2 = 0.163\,\mathrm{fm}^3\,. \tag{51}$$

The resulting dimensionless shape parameter, $P_t = v_2/r_t^3 = 0.0304$, proved to be positive. This is in agreement with the estimate in (47), which was obtained on the basis of the Bargmann representation of the S matrix.

In order to describe triplet scattering and the bound state in the two-nucleon system, we will use the pole approximation of the effective-range function (29). In doing this, we set the low-energy parameters a_t, r_t, and v_2 to the values in (49)–(51) and choose the value of the pole parameter D to be

$$D = -0.225526\,\mathrm{fm}^2\,. \tag{52}$$

With allowance for (28), this corresponds to the laboratory energy

$$T_0 = 368.026\,\mathrm{MeV}\,, \tag{53}$$

at which the experimental value of the triplet phase shift [39] changes sign. Thus, it can be seen, that, if the pole parameter D is fixed by using the experimental point $\delta\,(T_0) = 0$, the quantity D can be considered as an experimental parameter directly determined to a rather high degree of accuracy.

If one uses the parameter values in (49)–(52), then, as can be seen from the results of phase-shift calculations in Table 1 (the pole approximation P1), the pole approximation (29) describes the experimental triplet phase shift [39] up to laboratory energies of about 500 MeV with an absolute error not exceeding 0.5°. For the sake of comparison, the results obtained by calculating the phase shift within the effective-range approximation (ER) and within the shape-parameter approximation (SP) with the low-energy parameters set to the values in (49)–(51) are also presented in Table 1. As might have been expected, the effective-range approximation (34) describes well the phase shift only in the region of very low energies ($T_{\mathrm{lab}} \lesssim 10\,\mathrm{MeV}$). The shape-parameter approximation (44) describes well the experimental phase shift up to the energies of about 50 MeV (to within about 0.5°). At the same time, the pole approximation (29) provides an excellent description of the phase shift within a broad energy range, considerably improving the description in the low-energy region — for example, the experimental phase shift in the energy range $T_{\mathrm{lab}} \leqslant 40\,\mathrm{MeV}$ is described by formula (29) with an error not exceeding 0.01°, i.e. with better accuracy than accuracy of the experimental data (which is typically $\gtrsim 0.01^\circ$). In the above energy range, one can therefore consider the parametrization of the phase shift by the pole formula (29) as an alternative to the data of a partial-wave analysis (PWA). As a matter of fact, the approximation specified by Eq. (29) with the parameters given in (49)–(52) provides an excellent description of the phase shift in much wider energy interval than that which was used to find the parameters of this approximation. As can be seen from Fig. 1, the accuracy of the description of the phase shift undergoes virtually no deterioration up to an energy of 900 MeV, being 0.6° for laboratory energies of $T_{\rm lab} \leqslant 900\,{\rm MeV}$. Along with the phase shift corresponding to the pole approximation (29), the phase shift calculated within the effective-range approximation (34) and that calculated within the shape-parameter approximation (44) are also displayed in Fig. 1 for the sake of comparison.

By slightly varying the shape parameter v_2 and leaving the parameters a_t, r_t, and D unchanged, one can improve further the quality of description of the phase shift in the energy range $T_{lab} \lesssim 400\,{\rm MeV}$. The minimum absolute error of description of the phase shift in this energy range is attained at

$$v_2 = 0.168\,{\rm fm}^3 \tag{54}$$

and is about 0.1°, as can be seen in Table 1 (pole approximation P2). Thus, the pole approximation (29) makes it possible to describe, by using a small number of parameters, the phase shift over a wide energy range to a precision close to that in determining experimental data.

It should be noted that the value of the pole parameter D is very well determined by the experimental phase shift even at low energies and is close to the above value in (52). This can be shown most clearly by analyzing the dependence of the absolute error of the description of the phase shift,

$$\Delta = \max_{0 \leqslant T \leqslant T_{\rm max}} \left| \delta_{\rm expt}\left(T\right) - \delta_{\rm theor}\left(T\right) \right| \,, \tag{55}$$

on the parameter D in a given range $0 \leqslant T \leqslant T_{\rm max}$. The dependence of the accuracy Δ on the parameter D for the energy interval $0 \leqslant T \leqslant 20\,{\rm MeV}$ is displayed in Fig. 2. The phase shift in this case is described by the pole approximation (29) at fixed values of the low-energy parameters a_t, r_t, and v_2 (49)–(51), and at varying value of the pole parameter D. As can be seen from Fig. 2, the minimal error is achieved at negative values of D that are close to the value in (52), the dependence $\Delta(D)$ having quite a sharp character in the vicinity of the minimum, so that any significant deviation of the parameter D from the point of the minimum leads to a considerable deterioration of the quality of phase-shift description. We note that the value of $D = 0$ corresponds to the shape-parameter approximation and that, for $D \to \infty$, we obtain the effective-range approximation. The calculations show that, at the value of $D = -0.2147\,\mathrm{fm}^2$, which corresponds to the minimal deviation Δ, the absolute error of the description of the phase shift on the basis of (29) does not exceed 0.006° in the energy range being considered. At the same time, Δ takes values of 1.16° and 0.064° for, respectively, the effective-range and the shape-parameter approximation. Thus, we see that, even at low energies, the quality of the description of the phase shift by the pole formula is an order of magnitude higher than the quality of the description within the shape-parameter approximation, the value of the parameter D being negative and close to that in (52). We emphasize that the energy of $T_0 = 386.6\,\mathrm{MeV}$, at which the calculated phase shift changes sign and which is in good agreement with the experimental value in (53), corresponds to the above value of $D = -0.2147\,\mathrm{fm}^2$. Calculated values of the pole parameters D and T_0, and of the accuracy Δ are given in Table 2 for different energy intervals. As can be seen from Table 2, the pole parameter D is a quantity that admits an unambiguous determination yielding results that are rather weakly dependent on the interval of fitting. In fact, any fit to the phase shift leads, even at low energies, to negative values of the parameter D that are close to the value in (52). Thus, we see that, in just the same way as the parameters a_t, r_t, and v_2, D is a low-energy parameter that can be determined reliably and to a high precision.

The pole formula (29) for the function $k\cot\delta$ coincides in form with the well-known empirical Cini-Fubini-Stanghellini (CFS) formula [19], which was used to describe nucleon-nucleon scattering [19, 31–35] and which is generally written as

$$k\cot\delta = -\frac{1}{a_t} + \frac{1}{2}r_t k^2 - \frac{pk^4}{1+qk^2}\,. \tag{56}$$

A distinctive feature of the Cini-Fubini-Stanghellini approach is that the parameters $p \equiv -v_2$ and $q \equiv D$ in formula (56) are not independent — they are determined on the basis of the one-pion-exchange (OPE) theory of nucleon-nucleon interaction. Thus, the quantities p and

q in (56) are rather complicated functions of the scattering length a_t, the effective range r_t, the pion mass m_π, and the pion-nucleon coupling constant G^2. According to one-pion-exchange theory, the expressions for the parameters q and p can be written in the form [32, 33]

$$q = \lambdabar_\pi^2 \, \frac{2 - f^2 M \left(3/\sqrt{2} - 4\lambdabar_\pi/a_t - r_t/2\lambdabar_\pi\right)}{1 - f^2 M \left(1/2\sqrt{2} - \lambdabar_\pi/a_t\right)} \, , \tag{57}$$

$$p = \left(\lambdabar_\pi^2 - q/2\right) \left(2\sqrt{2}\lambdabar_\pi - r_t - 4\lambdabar_\pi^2/a_t\right) \, , \tag{58}$$

where $M \equiv m_N/m_\pi$ is the ratio of the nucleon mass to the pion mass, $\lambdabar_\pi \equiv \hbar/m_\pi c$ is the pion Compton wave length, and $f^2 \equiv \left(m_\pi/2m_N\right)^2 G^2$. For the low-energy scattering parameters a_t and r_t, we will use, in the following, the values obtained above and quoted in (49) and (50). On this basis, one can readily calculate the shape parameter v_2 and the pole parameter D within the Cini-Fubini-Stanghellini approach. The results are

$$v_2^{\mathrm{CFS}} = -0.121 \, \mathrm{fm}^3 \, , \tag{59}$$

$$D^{\mathrm{CFS}} = 3.777 \, \mathrm{fm}^2 \, . \tag{60}$$

It can be seen that the parameters v_2 and D calculated within the Cini-Fubini-Stanghellini approach differ considerably from the “experimental” values that are quoted in (51) and (52) and which are determined quite reliably from present-day data on the triplet phase shift [39]. It should be noted that the distinction is not only quantitative but also qualitative since the parameters v_2 and D have opposite signs within the Cini-Fubini-Stanghellini approach. The phase shift is described poorly with the Cini-Fubini-Stanghellini parameters. The explanation for so sharp a discrepancy with experimental data is likely to be the following. It has been firmly established that one-pion exchange is not the only mechanism and even is not the main mechanism of nucleon-nucleon interaction — the contribution of other mechanisms to nucleon-nucleon interaction is much more significant. Therefore, it comes as no surprise that the oversimplified one-pion-exchange scheme predicts erroneous values for the parameters v_2 and D. For want of a theory that would make it possible to calculate the low-energy parameters of nucleon-nucleon interaction on the basis of a microscopic approach (QCD), one has to treat them as adjustable parameters that are determined directly from experimental data.

Along with the aforesaid, we note that the recent calculation of the shape parameter v_2 within effective field theory (EFT) in [40, 41] also yielded an incorrect sign of v_2: $v_2^{\rm EFT} = -0.95\,{\rm fm}^3$, although calculations within this theory generally led to good agreement with experimental data for many computed features of the nucleon-nucleon and neutron-deuteron systems (see references quoted in [40, 41]). These discrepancies indicate that the shape parameter v_2 and the higher order parameters v_n are rather subtle and sensitive characteristics of the nucleon-nucleon interaction. In [40, 41], it was also indicated that the contribution to the nucleon-nucleon interaction from more "short-range" mechanisms than the one-pion-exchange mechanism is of importance.

4. LOW-ENERGY PARAMETERS OF THE EFFECTIVE-RANGE EXPANSION

Much attention has permanently been given to studying the low-energy parameters of the effective-range expansion (11) [12–15, 32–35, 37, 38, 40–50]. It should be noted that, while the scattering length a and the effective range r_0 can be determined directly from experimental data to a fairly high degree of precision [42–45], the higher order parameters v_n ($n = 2, 3, 4, \ldots$) are less convenient for an experimental determination, their theoretical calculation becoming more involved as the parameter order increases. At the same time, the shape parameters v_n, along with the scattering length a and the effective range r_0, are of particular importance for constructing and comparing various realistic models of nucleon-nucleon interaction and for describing nucleon-nucleon scattering. Moreover, the shape parameters are of importance for investigating the physical properties of the bound state in the two-nucleon system (deuteron) — in particular, their role in the useful expansion for the root-mean-square radius of the deuteron was demonstrated in [51–55]. The correlations between the properties of the deuteron and the parameters of nucleon-nucleon scattering that are determined by the expansion in (11) are also studied [51–56]. It should be noted that, in the past years, the parameters v_n were discussed and calculated in considering nucleon-nucleon interaction within effective field theory [40, 41].

In connection with the aforesaid, the determination of the parameters of the effective-range expansion (11) is of great importance. An explicit expansion of the function $k \cot \delta$ in a power series in k^2 follows directly from the pole representation (29):

$$k \cot \delta = -\frac{1}{a_t} + \frac{1}{2} r_t k^2 + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} v_2 \left(-D\right)^{n-2} k^{2n} . \tag{61}$$

Therefore, all of the shape parameters v_n can be also obtained explicitly for this case. We have

$$v_n = \left(-1\right)^n v_2 D^{n-2} , \;\; n \geqslant 3 . \tag{62}$$

Thus, we see that, in the pole approximation, all parameters v_n ($n = 3, 4, 5, \ldots$) of the effective-range expansion are determined explicitly in terms of the shape parameter v_2 and the pole parameter D according to the simple formula (62) and can easily be calculated to any order n.

It should be noted that the dimensionless shape parameters p_n are also used along with the dimensional shape parameters v_n [see Eq. (30)]. We define the dimensionless shape parameters p_n according to the relation

$$v_n = p_n r_t^{2n-1} . \tag{63}$$

It can easily be seen that the parameters p_n are coefficients of the power expansion of the function $k r_t \cot \delta_t$ with respect to the dimensionless parameter $x \equiv k r_t$. The dimensionless shape parameters p_n are convenient for qualitative analysis of the dependence of the phase shift on energy. In our case, the parameter D is negative by virtue of (52). Since we also have in our case $p_2 \equiv P_t = 0.0304 > 0$ and $|D/r_t^2| < 1$, one can easily see that all of the parameters p_n, defined according to Eqs. (62) and (63), are positive and decrease in absolute value; that is,

$$p_2 > p_3 > \ldots > p_n > p_{n+1} > \ldots > 0 . \tag{64}$$

In Table 3, the low-energy scattering parameters a_t, r_t, and v_2 are presented along with the parameters v_3, v_4 and v_5 calculated by formula (63) at the experimental value of $D = -0.225526\,\mathrm{fm}^2$ and the shape-parameter values of $v_2 = 0.163\,\mathrm{fm}^3$ (approximation P1) and $v_2 = 0.168\,\mathrm{fm}^3$ (approximation P2). For the sake of comparison, the parameters of the expansion in (11) that were found in [50] by using the partial-wave-analysis data on nucleon-nucleon scattering that were obtained by the Nijmegen group [57] (Nijm version) are also given in Table 3. We note that, at the present time, the partial-wave-analysis data obtained by the VPI/GWU group of Arndt et al. [39] and the Nijmegen group [57] are the most accurate and frequently used data on the phase shifts for nucleon-nucleon scattering. It can be seen from Table 3 that the values found here for the shape parameters v_n $(n = 3, 4, 5)$ on the basis of the pole approximation of the effective-range function are rather stable with respect to the variations in the shape parameter v_2. It can easily be shown that the parameters v_n are also rather weakly sensitive to the variation in the pole parameter D. Thus, formula (62) ensures a stable determination of the parameters v_n.

The following important comment concerning the applicability and accuracy of the simple one-pole approximation (29) for determining the parameters v_n is in order. Since the smooth interpolation curve specified by (29) provides an excellent description of experimental data of Arndt et al. on the phase shift [39] over a wide energy range (in particular, to a precision not poorer than 0.01° for energies up to $T_{\text{lab}} = 40\,\text{MeV}$), this curve determines the parameters v_n with the degree of reliability and stability as high as that to which they can in principle be determined by present-day experimental data on the phase shift, the error in these data being $\gtrsim 0.01^\circ$. This means that, if a different interpolation curve also described well the experimental phase shift and, for some parameters v_n, gave values considerably differing from those obtained here, one could conclude that these parameters v_n are not determined by experimental data. As a matter of fact, the calculations show that only the parameters to v_4 inclusively are determined more or less reliably.

Table 3 shows that the results for the low-energy scattering parameters, obtained here for the partial-wave-analysis data presented by Arndt et al. [39] are radically different from the results of the calculations performed in [50] for the partial-wave-analysis data of the Nijmegen group [57], the distinction being not only quantitative but also qualitative — that is, all shape parameters calculated here on the basis of the phase shifts of Arndt et al. are positive and decrease, while the analogous parameters calculated for the phase shifts of the Nijmegen group increase in absolute value and include a negative parameter (v_4). To be more exact, the latter observation concerns the dimensionless shape parameters p_n, which can be easily calculated according to Eq. (63) and which are given in Table 4.

A detailed investigation of the parameters of the effective-range expansion (11) will be given in our future publications. Here, we restrict ourselves to mentioning briefly the following: in order to reveal possible reasons behind such a discrepancy between the results, we have studied the stability of the calculation of the shape parameters v_n to variations in the triplet scattering length a_t. We have shown that their sensitivity to variations in this quantity is extremely high. In particular, a change in the scattering length a_t as small as a few tenths of a percent can lead to a severalfold change in the shape parameter v_2. This is in accord with the comment in the preceding section that the shape parameter v_2, as well as the higher order parameters v_n, is a rather subtle and sensitive characteristic of nucleon-nucleon interaction. Thus, so sharp a distinction between the shape parameters v_n for the GWU and the Nijmegen phase shifts is due to a significant difference in the scattering length: the value of $a_t^{\rm GWU} = 5.403\,{\rm fm}$, which was obtained in the present study, differs from $a_t^{\rm Nijm} = 5.420\,{\rm fm}$ more than by 0.3%. This difference in the values of the scattering length leads to a decrease in the shape parameter v_2 by a factor of 4 for the phase shifts of the Nijmegen group in relation to the phase shifts of the GWU group — that is, from the value of $v_2^{\rm GWU} = 0.163\,{\rm fm}^3$ to the value of $v_2^{\rm Nijm} = 0.040\,{\rm fm}^3$. The discrepancy between the corresponding higher order parameters v_n is still larger. At the same time, Table 3 shows that the values of the effective range r_t for the GWU and the Nijmegen phase shifts are close to each other. It should also be noted that our results on the shape parameter v_2 are close to the results of some earlier studies. In particular, the value of the shape parameter $v_2 = 0.137\,{\rm fm}^3$ corresponding to the dimensionless shape parameter $P_t = 0.027$ for the Reid soft-core potential RSC [58] agrees well with the value of $v_2 = 0.163\,{\rm fm}^3$, which was obtained in the present study.

We note that the Nijmegen value of the triplet scattering length $a_t^{\rm Nijm} = 5.420\,{\rm fm}$ is rather close to the presently recommended experimental value [59]

$$a_t^{\rm expt} = 5.424\,{\rm fm}\,, \tag{65}$$

while the value calculated here on the basis of the GWU phase shifts [39], $a_t^{\rm GWU} = 5.403\,{\rm fm}$, is close to some of the experimental values obtained previously for the triplet scattering length [32, 42, 43]. It should be emphasized that, for the experimental values of the triplet scattering length a_t, various authors [32–35, 38, 39, 42–46, 58–61] present values changing within a broad range — from 5.37 [38, 60] to 5.479 fm [61]. We also note that the present-day experimental value of the triplet scattering length in (65) leads to exaggerated (in relation to experimental data) values of the root-mean-square radius r_d of the deuteron [52, 53, 56] and the asymptotic normalization constant A_S for it [56]. From all of the aforesaid, we can therefore draw the following important conclusion: in order to remove the existing discrepancies between the current experimental value of a_t in (65), on one hand, and the present-day values of the quantities r_d and A_S for the deuteron and the partial-wave-analysis data of the GWU group, which lead to the value of $a_t^{\mathrm{GWU}} = 5.403\,\mathrm{fm}$, on the other hand, it is of paramount importance to refine the experimental value of the triplet scattering length a_t. The value of the triplet scattering length a_t is also of particular importance since it is often used as one of the input values in fitting the parameters of nucleon-nucleon potentials. We note that the value of $a_t^{\mathrm{GWU}} = 5.403\,\mathrm{fm}$, which corresponds to the partial-wave analysis performed by Arndt et al., is in perfect agreement with the experimental values of the quantities r_d and A_S for the deuteron [56].

In a wide energy range [approximately to the energy corresponding to the pole of the function $k\cot\delta$ (53)], the experimental triplet phase shift [39] is well described by the effective-range expansion (11) with the low-energy scattering parameters a_t, r_t, v_2, $v_3, \ldots$ set to the values determined here. This is a direct corollary of the fact that, for the phase shift borrowed from [39], all of the dimensionless shape parameters p_n appear to be decreasing in absolute value. For example, a fifth-degree polynomial in k^2 describes the experimental phase shift in the energy range $T_{\mathrm{lab}} \leqslant 200\,\mathrm{MeV}$ to within about 1° and in the energy range $T_{\mathrm{lab}} \leqslant 50\,\mathrm{MeV}$ to within about 0.02°. The description of the function $k\cot\delta$ by various-degree polynomials corresponding to various polynomial approximations of the effective-range expansion (11) are shown in Fig. 3. We see that a successive increase in the degree of a polynomial leads to an improved description of the function $k\cot\delta$ (and, accordingly, of the phase shift) and to the extension of the interval where this description is valid. Thus, the use of the effective-range expansion with a small number of terms provides a good description of the phase shift over a wide energy range ($0 - 250\,\mathrm{MeV}$) if the low-energy parameters are set to the values found here. This indicates that, in contrast to statements advocated in some articles (see, for example, [50]), the effective-range expansion is highly accurate and very useful in describing nucleon-nucleon scattering.

The potential of the effective-range expansion (11) is directly related to the radius of its convergence. The function $k\cot\delta$ considered in the complex plane of k^2 is an analytic function of k^2 within some region near the origin of coordinates; therefore, it can be expanded in a Taylor-Maclaurin series (11) in powers of k^2 in the vicinity of the point $k^2 = 0$. Thus, a particular importance of the function $k \cot \delta$ is associated with its analyticity near the point $k^2 = 0$. Noyes and Wong [62] showed that the one-pion-exchange model for nucleon-nucleon interaction leads to the appearance of a cut in the scattering amplitude on the negative axis of energy for $k^2 \leqslant -m_\pi^2 c^2 / 4\hbar^2$; therefore, the radius of convergence of the series in (11) is extremely small in the one-pion-exchange model, $T_0 = m_\pi^2 / 2m_N = 9.7\,\mathrm{MeV}$. This contradicts the fact that the experimental phase shift [39] is well described by the pole formula (29) with the parameters set to the values in (49)–(52), since, for the radius of convergence of the series in (11), formula (29) gives the value of $T_0 = 368.026\,\mathrm{MeV}$, which we chose on the basis of the "experimental" condition $\delta\left(T_0\right) = 0$ (the convergence circle is determined by the condition $|k^2| < 1/\left|D\right|$). In connection with this contradiction, we recall the comments at the end of the preceding section that concern the limited applicability of the one-pion-exchange mechanism. As was indicated by Noyes himself [33], there is no a priori method for estimating the accuracy or the region of applicability of the phenomenological expansion (11), so that this question must be solved on the basis of experimental data.

Numerical values of the dimensionless shape parameters p_n provide direct information about the radius of convergence of the series in (11). In the case under consideration, the increase in the parameters p_n in absolute value indicates, as is the case for the triplet np phase shift of the Nijmegen group, that the effective-range expansion (11) has a small radius of convergence, so that it is not very useful [50]. On the contrary, the decrease in the shape parameters p_n for the triplet np phase shift of the GWU group suggests that the radius of convergence of the series in (11) is large and that this expansion is very useful in this case. This is corroborated by a high quality of the description of the phase shift in the case where the function $k \cot \delta$ is approximated by polynomials of relatively low degrees. Thus, the present-day data from the partial-wave analyses performed by the two main groups in [39] and [57] do not agree with each other both in what is concerned with the low-energy scattering parameters calculated on their basis and in what is concerned with the applicability of the effective-range expansion to them. At the same time, it is important to note that the numerical values obtained for the phase shifts by the GWU and the Nijmegen group are rather close to each other. This indicates once again that the low-energy scattering parameters are subtle and sensitive characteristics of nucleon-nucleon scattering.

Following the same line of reasoning as in the case of constructing the effective-range expansion (11), one can write an expansion of the function $k\cot\delta$ in a power series at the point $k^2=-\alpha^2$ — that is, at the energy equal to the deuteron binding energy $\varepsilon_d=\hbar^2\alpha^2/m_N$. This expansion has the form

$$k\cot\delta=-\alpha+\frac{1}{2}\rho_d\left(k^2+\alpha^2\right)+w_2\left(k^2+\alpha^2\right)^2+\dots\,, \tag{66}$$

where $\rho_d\equiv\rho\left(-\varepsilon_d,-\varepsilon_d\right)$ is the deuteron effective range corresponding to S-wave interaction. The definition and the properties of the effective deuteron range ρ_d and of the function $\rho\left(E_1,E_2\right)$ are discussed in detail elsewhere [38]. Using Eqs. (29) and (66), we can easily establish that the quantities α and ρ_d for the deuteron are related to the parameters of the pole representation of the effective-range function as

$$\alpha=\frac{1}{a_t}+\frac{1}{2}r_t\alpha^2-\frac{v_2\alpha^4}{1-D\alpha^2}\,, \tag{67}$$

$$\rho_d=\rho_m-\frac{2v_2\alpha^2}{\left(1-D\alpha^2\right)^2}\,, \tag{68}$$

where $\rho_m\equiv\rho\left(0,-\varepsilon_d\right)$ is the so-called mixed effective range given by

$$\rho_m=\frac{2}{\alpha}\left(1-\frac{1}{\alpha a_t}\right)\,. \tag{69}$$

Using formulas (67) and (69), we can recast the expression for the mixed effective range ρ_m into the form

$$\rho_m=r_t-\frac{2v_2\alpha^2}{1-D\alpha^2}\,. \tag{70}$$

From formulas (70) and (68), one can easily obtain expansions of the standard scattering effective range r_t and the deuteron effective range ρ_d in power series in α^2. We have

$$r_t=\rho_m-2\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(-1\right)^n v_{n+1}\alpha^{2n}\,, \tag{71}$$

$$\rho_d=\rho_m+2\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(-1\right)^n n\,v_{n+1}\alpha^{2n}\,, \tag{72}$$

where the parameters v_n are given by (62). The dimensionless asymptotic normalization factor C_d for the deuteron is expressed in terms of the deuteron effective range ρ_d as

$$C_d^2=\left(1-\alpha\rho_d\right)^{-1}\,. \tag{73}$$

The constant C_d and the asymptotic normalization factor A_S, which is widely used in the literature [47, 63], are related by the equation

$$A_S^2 = 2\alpha C_d^2\,. \tag{74}$$

For various approximations of the effective-range function, we have calculated the following parameters characterizing the deuteron: the binding energy ε_d, the effective range ρ_d, and the asymptotic normalization factors C_d and A_S. In Table 5, the results of these calculations are given along with their experimental counterparts from [64, 65]. We note that the deuteron binding energy was calculated by using a relativistic formula, which is more accurate than (21). It can be seen from Table 5 that the features of the deuteron that were calculated in the pole approximation (29) with the parameter values from (49)–(52) are in good agreement with their experimental values. The results obtained in the shape-parameter approximation (SP) differ insignificantly from their counterparts in the pole approximation, while the results of the calculations that take into account the cubic term in energy in the effective-range expansion are nearly coincident with those in the pole approximation. It can be seen from Table 5 that the convergence of the calculated features of the deuteron versus the number of terms that are taken into account in the effective-range expansion is very fast — the shape-parameter approximation yields a highly precise result, the inclusion of higher order terms in energy introduces virtually no changes in this result. This is a consequence of the fact that the dimensionless shape parameters p_n are decreasing quantities in this case. It should be emphasized that the features of the deuteron were calculated on the basis of the scattering-parameter values in (49)–(52), which correspond to the phase shifts of Arndt et al., and this means that we have very good agreement between the experimental data of the GWU group on scattering [39] and the experimental data on the bound state (deuteron) from [64, 65].

The values found for the features of the deuteron in the effective-range approximation (ER) are somewhat exaggerated in relation to their experimental counterparts and the results obtained in the pole approximation. This is due primarily to an insufficiently accurate determination of the deuteron binding energy in the effective-range approximation with the low-energy parameters $a_t = 5.403\,\mathrm{fm}$ and $r_t = 1.7494\,\mathrm{fm}$. If one uses the experimental values for the deuteron binding energy and for the triplet scattering length ($\varepsilon_d = 2.224589\,\mathrm{MeV}$

and $a_t = 5.403\,\mathrm{fm}$, respectively), the effective-range approximation yields the following values for the deuteron effective range ρ_d and for the asymptotic normalization factor A_S: $\rho_d = 1.7331\,\mathrm{fm}$ and $A_S = 0.8795\,\mathrm{fm}^{-1/2}$, these results being in good agreement with the corresponding experimental values and with the results of the calculations in the pole approximation. This is in accord with the results obtained in [56], where it was established that the asymptotic normalization factor A_S depends only slightly on the model of nucleon-nucleon interaction; at the experimental value of the deuteron binding energy ε_d, 99.7% of it is determined by the triplet scattering length a_t.

6. PARAMETERS OF THE BARGMANN S MATRIX

The parameters α, β, λ, and μ of the Bargmann S matrix (20), which corresponds to the presence of two physical states in the system, are unambiguously related to the parameters of the pole approximation of the effective-range function (29) and, as can easily be seen, are the roots of the fourth-degree algebraic equation

$$v_2 x^4 - \left(1 - D x^2\right)\left(\frac{1}{a_t} + \frac{1}{2} r_t x^2 - x\right) = 0\,. \tag{75}$$

Solving Eq. (75) with the parameters set to the values in (49)–(52), we obtain the following values for the parameters of the Bargmann S matrix:

$$\alpha = 0.2315\,\mathrm{fm}^{-1},\ \beta = 1.2293\,\mathrm{fm}^{-1},\ \lambda = 2.5603 + i3.5248\,\mathrm{fm}^{-1},\ \mu = 2.5603 - i3.5248\,\mathrm{fm}^{-1}. \tag{76}$$

In the case being considered, the two-nucleon system has two bound states. In accordance with the phenomenology of nodes that employs potentials involving forbidden states [16–18], the lowest, deeply lying, state characterized by the energy

$$\varepsilon_0 = 63.7555\,\mathrm{MeV}\,, \tag{77}$$

is unobservable, while the excited state of binding energy

$$\varepsilon_d = 2.2237\,\mathrm{MeV} \tag{78}$$

corresponds to the deuteron.

Thus, the use of the pole approximation in describing triplet neutron-proton scattering automatically leads to considering deep potentials involving forbidden states.

In the shape-parameter approximation (44) ($D = 0$), we have the following values for the parameters of the Bargmann S matrix (20):

$$\alpha = 0.2315\,\mathrm{fm}^{-1},\ \beta = -2.7787\,\mathrm{fm}^{-1},\ \lambda = 1.2736 + i0.3784\,\mathrm{fm}^{-1},\ \mu = 1.2736 - i0.3784\,\mathrm{fm}^{-1}. \tag{79}$$

In this case, the second state is a virtual state at the energy

$$\varepsilon_v = 353.4732\,\mathrm{MeV}\,, \tag{80}$$

while the ground state, whose binding energy is

$$\varepsilon_d = 2.2236\,\mathrm{MeV} \tag{81}$$

[in fact, it coincides with that in (78)], corresponds to the deuteron. As might have been expected, the parameters in (79) satisfy relation (43).

7. CONCLUSION

Our basic results and conclusions can be formulated as follows. Relying on the Bargmann representation of the S matrix, we have formulated the pole approximation for the effective-range function $k\cot\delta$. At specific values of the S-matrix parameters, the effective-range approximation and the shape-parameter approximation immediately follow from this approximation. The pole approximation of the function $k\cot\delta$ is optimal for describing nucleon-nucleon scattering and involves a few parameters. The parameters of this approximation have a clear physical meaning. They are related to the parameters of the Bargmann S matrix by simple equations. It has been shown that the pole approximation deduced from the Bargmann representation of the S matrix is a direct generalization of the effective-range approximation to the case where there are two physical states in the system. The presence of the pole term makes it possible to improve significantly, by using only two additional parameters, the description of the phase shift and to expand sizably the applicability range of this description. In the shape-parameter approximation corresponding to the Bargmann representation of the S matrix, one can obtain an important constraint on the dimensionless shape parameter, $P > 0$ — that is, the shape parameter is positive.

By using a least squares polynomial fit to the function $k\cot\delta$ at low energies, we have obtained, on the basis of the analysis of the latest experimental data on phase shifts that was performed by the VPI/GWU group, the triplet low-energy parameters of neutron-proton scattering: $a_t = 5.4030\,\mathrm{fm}$, $r_t = 1.7494\,\mathrm{fm}$, and $v_2 = 0.163\,\mathrm{fm}^3$. With these values of a_t, r_t, and v_2 and the pole parameter D, the pole approximation of the function $k\cot\delta$ provides an excellent description of the triplet phase shift for neutron-proton scattering over a wide energy range ($T_{\mathrm{lab}} \lesssim 1000\,\mathrm{MeV}$), the description in the low-energy region also being improved considerably.

For the experimental phase shifts of the VPI/GWU group, the values that we have obtained on the basis of the pole approximation for the triplet shape parameters of the effective-range expansion are positive and decrease with increasing n. On the basis of the effective-range expansion with the values found for the low-energy scattering parameters a_t, r_t, v_2, $v_3, \ldots$, the phase shift is described well over a wide energy range extending approximately to the energy at which the phase shift changes sign, this being a direct consequence of a decrease in the dimensionless shape parameters with increasing n. This circumstance is indicative of a high precision of the effective-range expansion and its high potential for describing experimental data on nucleon-nucleon scattering, in contrast to the statements of some authors (see, for example, [50]).

The results obtained here for the shape parameters by using the data of the partial-wave analysis performed by the GWU group differ drastically from the results of the calculations in [50] for the data of the partial-wave analysis performed by the Nijmegen group, this distinction being not only quantitative but also qualitative — that is, all of the dimensionless shape parameters calculated here by using the phase shifts of the GWU group are positive and decrease, while the analogous parameters calculated for the Nijmegen phase shifts increase in absolute value and include a negative parameter (p_4). In our opinion, so sharp a discrepancy between the shape parameters for the GWU and the Nijmegen phase shifts is due to quite a significant difference in the scattering length: the value $a_t^{\mathrm{GWU}} = 5.403\,\mathrm{fm}$ obtained here differs from $a_t^{\mathrm{Nijm}} = 5.420\,\mathrm{fm}$ more than by 0.3%. This difference in the scattering length leads to the decrease in the shape parameter v_2 by a factor of 4 for the Nijmegen phase shifts in relation to the phase shifts obtained by the GWU group — that is, from the value $v_2^{\mathrm{GWU}} = 0.163\,\mathrm{fm}^3$ to the value of $v_2^{\mathrm{Nijm}} = 0.040\,\mathrm{fm}^3$ — the discrepancy between the corresponding values of the higher order parameters v_n being still greater. This confirms that the shape parameter v_2, as well as the higher order parameters v_n, is a rather subtle and sensitive characteristic of nucleon-nucleon interaction. The aforesaid leads to the important conclusion that an experimental refinement of the triplet scattering length a_t is of paramount importance since it is necessary to remove the existing discrepancies between the current experimental value of $a_t^{\mathrm{expt}} = 5.424\,\mathrm{fm}$, on one hand, and the present-day values of r_d and A_S for the deuteron [56] and the present-day data of the partial-wave analysis performed by the GWU group, which lead to the value of $a_t^{\mathrm{GWU}} = 5.403\,\mathrm{fm}$, on the other hand.

For various approximations of the effective-range function, we have calculated the main features of the deuteron — the binding energy ε_d, the effective range ρ_d, and the asymptotic normalization factors C_d and A_S. The results obtained for them in the pole approximation agree very well with their experimental counterparts. The results in the shape-parameter approximation differ insignificantly from those in the pole approximation. We have found that the convergence of the calculated features of the deuteron versus the number of terms that are taken into account in the effective-range expansion is very fast — the shape-parameter approximation gives a nearly precise result, which undergoes virtually no changes upon taking into account higher order terms in energy. Thus, we can state that, on the basis of the Bargmann representation of the S matrix, a good unified description has been obtained for the bound state of the two-nucleon system and the triplet phase shift for neutron-proton scattering up to energies of about 1000 MeV.

REFERENCES

1. A. G. Sitenko, *Scattering Theory* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991).
2. W. Heisenberg, Z. Phys. **120,** 513 (1943).
3. R. Jost, Helv. Phys. Acta **20**, 256 (1947).
4. R. G. Newton, *Scattering Theory of Waves and Particles*, 2nd ed. (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1982).
5. V. A. Babenko and N. M. Petrov, Phys. At. Nucl. **63**, 1709 (2000).
6. V. V. Malyarov and M. N. Popushoi, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **18**, 586 (1973).

7. B. N. Zakhar'ev, V. N. Pivovarchik, E. B. Plekhanov, *et al.*, Sov. J. Part. Nucl. **13**, 535 (1982).
8. B. N. Zakhar'ev, P. Yu. Nikishev, and E. B. Plekhanov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **38**, 54 (1983).
9. V. Bargmann, Rev. Mod. Phys. **21**, 488 (1949).
10. W. T. H. van Oers and J. D. Seagrave, Phys. Lett. B **24**, 562 (1967).
11. G. A. Baker, Jr. and P. Graves-Morris, *Padé Approximants* (Addison-Wesley, London, 1981).
12. F. Lambert, O. Corbella, and Z. D. Thome, Nucl. Phys. B **90,** 267 (1975).
13. K. Hartt, Phys. Rev. C **22**, 1377 (1980).
14. K. Hartt, Phys. Rev. C **23**, 2399 (1981).
15. K. Hartt, Bull. Am. Phys. Soc. **23**, 630 (1978).
16. V. G. Neudatchin, I. T. Obukhovsky, V. I. Kukulin, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **11**, 128 (1975).
17. V. G. Neudatchin, I. T. Obukhovsky, and Yu. F. Smirnov, Sov. J. Part. Nucl. **15**, 519 (1984).
18. V. I. Kukulin, V. M. Krasnopolskij, V. N. Pomerantsev, *et al.*, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **43**, 355 (1986).
19. M. Cini, S. Fubini, and A. Stanghellini, Phys. Rev. **114**, 1633 (1959).
20. R. S. Christian and J. L. Gammel, Phys. Rev. **91**, 100 (1953).
21. L. M. Delves, Phys. Rev. **118**, 1318 (1960).
22. A. S. Reiner, Phys. Lett. B **28**, 387 (1969).
23. J. S. Whiting and M. G. Fuda, Phys. Rev. C **14**, 18 (1976).

24. V. E. Kuz'michev, Ukr. Fiz. Zh. **23**, 188 (1978) [in Russian].

25. B. A. Girard and M. G. Fuda, Phys. Rev. C **19**, 579 (1979).

26. S. A. Adhikari and J. R. A. Torreao, Phys. Lett. B **132**, 257 (1983).

27. I. V. Simenog, A. I. Sitnichenko, and D. V. Shapoval, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **45**, 37 (1987).

28. C. R. Chen, G. L. Payne, J. L. Friar, and B. F. Gibson, Phys. Rev. C **39**, 1261 (1989).

29. Yu. V. Orlov and L. I. Nikitina, Phys. At. Nucl. **61**, 750 (1998).

30. Yu. V. Orlov, Yu. P. Orevkov, and L. I. Nikitina, Phys. At. Nucl. **65**, 371 (2002).

31. D. Y. Wong and H. P. Noyes, Phys. Rev. **126**, 1866 (1962).

32. H. P. Noyes, Phys. Rev. **130**, 2025 (1963).

33. H. P. Noyes, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Sci. **22**, 465 (1972).

34. L. Mathelitsch and B. J. VerWest, Phys. Rev. C **29**, 739 (1984).

35. J. R. Bergervoet, P. C. van Campen, W. A. van der Sanden, and J. J. de Swart, Phys. Rev. C **38**, 15 (1988).

36. V. M. Galitsky, B. M. Karnakov, and V. I. Kogan, *Problems in Quantum Mechanics* (Nauka, Moscow, 1992) [in Russian].

37. J. M. Blatt and J. D. Jackson, Phys. Rev. **76**, 18 (1949).

38. L. Hulthén and M. Sugawara, in *Handbuch der Physik*, Ed. by S. Flügge (Springer-Verlag, New York, Berlin, 1957), p. 1.

39. R. A. Arndt, W. J. Briscoe, I. I. Strakovsky, and R. L. Workman, *Partial-Wave Analysis Facility SAID*, The George Washington University [http://gwdac.phys.gwu.edu] ; Phys. Rev. C **62**, 034005 (2000).

40. T. D. Cohen and J. M. Hansen, Phys. Rev. C **59**, 13 (1999).

41. T. D. Cohen and J. M. Hansen, Phys. Rev. C **59**, 3047 (1999).

42. R. Wilson, *The Nucleon-Nucleon Interaction* (Interscience, New York, 1963).

43. T. L. Houk and R. Wilson, Rev. Mod. Phys. **39**, 546 (1967).

44. T. L. Houk, Phys. Rev. C **3**, 1886 (1971).

45. E. L. Lomon and R. Wilson, Phys. Rev. C **9**, 1329 (1974).

46. W. Dilg, Phys. Rev. C **11**, 103 (1975).

47. M. W. Kermode, A. McKerrell, J. P. McTavish, and L. J. Allen, Z. Phys. A **303,** 167 (1981).

48. C. W. Wong, Nucl. Phys. A **536,** 269 (1992).

49. W. van Dijk, M. W. Kermode, and D.-C. Zheng, Phys. Rev. C **47**, 1898 (1993).

50. J. J. de Swart, C. P. F. Terheggen, and V. G. J. Stoks, *Invited talk at the 3rd International Symposium "Dubna Deuteron 95", Dubna, Russia, July 4-7, 1995,* nucl-th/9509032.

51. M. W. Kermode, S. A. Moszkowski, M. M. Mustafa, and W. van Dijk, Phys. Rev. C **43**, 416 (1991).

52. D. W. L. Sprung, in *Proceedings of IX European Conference on Few-Body Problems in Physics, Tbilisi, Georgia, USSR, Aug. 1984,* (World Sci. Press, Singapore; Philadelphia, 1984), p. 234.

53. S. Klarsfeld, J. Martorell, J. A. Oteo *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. A **456**, 373 (1986).

54. D. W. L. Sprung, H. Wu, and J. Martorell, Phys. Rev. C **42**, 863 (1990).

55. R. K. Bhaduri, W. Leidemann, G. Orlandini, and E. L. Tomusiak, Phys. Rev. C **42**, 1867 (1990).

56. V. A. Babenko and N. M. Petrov, Phys. At. Nucl. **66**, 1319 (2003).

57. Nijmegen NN-Online program [http://nn-online.sci.kun.nl] ; V. G. J. Stoks, R. A. M. Klomp, M. C. M. Rentmeester, and J. J. de Swart, Phys. Rev. C **48**, 792 (1993).

58. R. V. Reid, Jr., Ann. Phys. **50**, 411 (1968).

59. O. Dumbrajs, R. Koch, H. Pilkuhn, *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. B **216**, 277 (1983).

60. G. L. Squires and A. T. Stewart, Proc. Roy. Soc. A **230**, 19 (1955).

61. H. Kaiser, H. Rauch, G. Badurek, *et al.*, Z. Phys. A **291**, 231 (1979).

62. H. P. Noyes and D. Y. Wong, Phys. Rev. Lett. **3**, 191 (1959).

63. T. E. O. Ericson, Nucl. Phys. A **416,** 281 (1984).

64. G. L. Greene, E. G. Kessler Jr., R. D. Deslattes, and H. Boerner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56**, 819 (1986).

65. I. Borbély, W. Grüebler, V. König, *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **160**, 17 (1985).

Table 1. Triplet phase shift for *np* scattering as a function of the laboratory energy $T_{\rm lab}$ according to calculations within the effective-range (ER) approximation, the shape-parameter (SP) approximation, and the pole (P1 and P2) approximations (for the shape-parameter values $v_2 = 0.163\,{\rm fm}^3$ and $v_2 = 0.168\,{\rm fm}^3$, respectively).

$T_{\rm lab}$,	Phase shift δ_t, deg				
MeV	ER	SP	P1	P2	Experiment [39]
1	147.84	147.83	147.83	147.83	147.83
5	118.34	118.23	118.23	118.23	118.23
10	102.93	102.56	102.55	102.54	102.55
25	81.87	80.36	80.26	80.20	80.26
40	71.19	68.44	68.11	68.01	68.11
50	66.23	62.68	62.14	62.01	62.11
75	57.51	52.16	50.90	50.70	50.77
100	51.64	44.80	42.60	42.34	42.34
125	47.30	39.25	35.95	35.66	35.58
150	43.93	34.89	30.37	30.05	29.94
175	41.19	31.35	25.53	25.19	25.09
200	38.92	28.42	21.23	20.90	20.84
225	36.99	25.95	17.36	17.04	17.03
250	35.32	23.84	13.81	13.53	13.57
275	33.86	22.01	10.53	10.29	10.37
300	32.57	20.42	7.47	7.28	7.38
325	31.41	19.02	4.60	4.47	4.56
350	30.38	17.78	1.88	1.82	1.87
375	29.44	16.68	−0.71	−0.69	−0.71
400	28.58	15.69	−3.18	−3.07	−3.20
425	27.79	14.79	−5.54	−5.34	−5.61
450	27.06	13.99	−7.82	−7.51	−7.94
475	26.39	13.25	−10.02	−9.59	−10.21
500	25.77	12.58	−12.14	−11.60	−12.41

Table 2. Calculated values of the pole parameters D and T_0, and of the accuracy of the phase-shift description Δ for different energy intervals $0 \leqslant T \leqslant T_{\max}$.

$T_{\max}$, MeV	D, fm^2	T_0, MeV	Δ, deg
10	−0.2007	413.5	0.0056
20	−0.2147	386.6	0.0057
30	−0.2172	382.1	0.0058
40	−0.2236	371.2	0.0091
50	−0.2303	360.4	0.014
60	−0.2355	352.4	0.020
80	−0.2416	343.5	0.029
100	−0.2432	341.3	0.032
150	−0.2412	344.1	0.061
200	−0.2356	352.3	0.16
250	−0.2315	358.5	0.26
300	−0.2290	362.4	0.33
350	−0.2279	364.2	0.36
368	−0.2256	368.0	0.44

Table 3. Triplet low-energy scattering parameters obtained by using the data of the partial-wave analysis performed by the GWU group (versions GWU P1 and GWU P2 correspond to the pole approximation at the shape-parameter values of $v_2 = 0.163\,\mathrm{fm}^3$ and $v_2 = 0.168\,\mathrm{fm}^3$, respectively) and the data of the partial-wave analysis performed by the Nijmegen group [50, 57] (Nijm version).

Version	a_t, fm	r_t, fm	v_2, fm^3	v_3, fm^5	v_4, fm^7	v_5, fm^9
GWU P1	5.4030	1.7494	0.163	0.037	0.0083	0.0019
GWU P2	5.4030	1.7494	0.168	0.038	0.0085	0.0019
Nijm	5.420	1.753	0.040	0.672	−3.96	27.1

Table 4. Triplet dimensionless shape parameters p_n obtained by using the data of the partial-wave analysis performed by the GWU group (version GWU corresponds to the pole approximation P1 at the shape-parameter value of $v_2 = 0.163\,\mathrm{fm}^3$) and the data of the partial-wave analysis performed by the Nijmegen group [50, 57] (Nijm version).

Version	p_2	p_3	p_4	p_5
GWU	0.0304	0.0023	0.00017	0.000012
Nijm	0.00743	0.0406	−0.0778	0.173

Table 5. Features of the deuteron according to calculations within various approximations of the effective-range expansion (ER, SP, v_n) and in the pole approximation P1.

Version	ε_d, MeV	ρ_d, fm	C_d	A_S, fm$^{-1/2}$
ER	2.2387	1.7494	1.2979	0.8846
SP	2.2236	1.7145	1.2876	0.8761
v_3	2.2237	1.7151	1.2878	0.8763
v_4	2.2237	1.7151	1.2878	0.8763
v_5	2.2237	1.7151	1.2878	0.8763
P1	2.2237	1.7151	1.2878	0.8763
Experiment	2.224589	1.7251	1.2904	0.8781

Fig. 1. Triplet phase shift for neutron-proton scattering as a function of the laboratory energy according to calculations within the effective-range (ER), the shape-parameter (SP), and the pole (P1) approximation. The points represent experimental data borrowed from [39].

Fig. 2. Dependence of the accuracy of the phase-shift description Δ on the pole parameter D for the energy interval $0 \leqslant T \leqslant 20\,\mathrm{MeV}$.

Fig. 3. Triplet effective-range function $k \cot \delta$ versus the laboratory energy for various polynomial approximations of the effective-range expansion (11). The figures on the curves indicate the order of approximation. The upper curve corresponds to experimental data borrowed from [39].

This figure "fig1.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/nucl-th/0502041v1

This figure "fig2.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/nucl-th/0502041v1

This figure "fig3.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/nucl-th/0502041v1